

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this application. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is herein amended to more clearly recite the "mold" is an overmold. Claims 8 and 9 are herein amended to track the amendment to claim 1. Support for the present amendment is found throughout Applicant's specification as filed, and additionally, Examiner is kindly directed to claim 10 which also recites overmold. No new matter is introduced.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Batten, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,613). This rejection is traversed, and Applicants request reconsideration.

In independent claim 1, as amended herein, Applicant claims a cable terminator. The cable terminator includes a printed circuit board having termination circuitry, a ribbon cable having a first end and a second end with the first end being electrically connected to the printed circuit board to enable termination at the first end, and an encapsulating overmold enclosing the printed circuit board and the first end of the ribbon cable.

Batten, Jr. et al. teach an assembly of an electronic device within a chamber defined by a flexible container. The device may be a printed circuit board, but is not further specified. Within the flexible container, conductors on the device are electrically isolated from an EMI protection layer which forms part of a laminate construction wall of the flexible container. Capacitive coupling is provided between the EMI protection layer and a ground conductor.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in the reference, either expressly or inherently described. MPEP 2131. Applicants respectfully submit that Batten, Jr. et al. do not anticipate Applicants' independent claims 1.

Specifically, Applicant has very narrowly claimed a specific item, the cable terminator. Of particular note, Applicant's claim limitations include a printed circuit board having termination circuitry. Further, the first end of the ribbon cable is connected to the printed circuit board to enable termination. Further still, Applicant has recited an encapsulating overmold that encloses the printed circuitry board and the first end of the ribbon cable.

While Batten, Jr. et al. may teach a device which may be a printed circuit board, Batten, Jr. et al. do not teach or suggest termination circuitry, or that the ribbon cable is connected to the printed circuit board to enable termination. Further, the flexible container as taught by Batten, Jr. et al. is not an overmold. Applicants have described in detail, illustrated, and claimed (now withdrawn, but in the application as filed), an overmold and a method for making an overmold. Specifically, an overmold is formed by inserting a terminating circuit board with attached cable into a forming mold, and injecting desired overmold material to form the overmold (see Applicant's specification as filed, page 17, 3-21, and Fig. 5, for example). While Batten, Jr. et al. may describe a flexible container which is capable of being sealed or heat sealed around the cable that inserts into the flexible container, Batten, Jr. et al. do not teach or suggest an overmold.

For at least the above reasons, the Batten, Jr. et al. reference fails to teach each and every element as set forth in Applicant's independent claim 1, and therefore fails to anticipate Applicant's independent claim 1.

As Batten, Jr. et al. fail to anticipate Applicant's independent claim 1, so too does the reference fail to anticipate dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 9. Applicant further notes that although it may have been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations, the limitations recited in claims 2 (SCSI cable), 3 (LVD cable) are not use limitations. In independent claim 1, Applicant has recited a ribbon cable. In claim 2, Applicant has further narrowed the claim to a specific type of ribbon cable, a SCSI cable, and in claim 3, Applicant has further narrowed claim 1 to a specific type of ribbon cable, an LVD cable. These are narrow, feature limitations, and not use limitations. Therefore, these further narrowing claims are not anticipated by at least the reasons given above for independent claim 1, plus the additional narrowing limitations as described.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits the specifically and narrowly claimed independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 9, each of which directly or indirectly depends from independent claim 1, are not anticipated by the patent to Batten, Jr. et al., and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, 10-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sanada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,027). This rejection is traversed, and Applicants request reconsideration.

Applicant's independent claim is as described above. Applicant's independent claim 10 claims a SCSI cable having an integrated terminator. The SCSI cable and integrated terminator include a ribbon cable with a first end, a second end, and at least one device connector between the first end and the second end. The SCSI cable and integrated terminator also includes a printed circuit board having termination circuitry. The termination circuitry is electrically coupled to the first end of the SCSI cable. Finally, the SCSI cable and integrated terminator includes an overmold sealing the printed circuit board and the first end of the SCSI cable. The overmold retains a single output path for the SCSI cable that extends to the second end.

Sanada et al. teach an electronic control unit having a control circuit substrate having control elements and a driving circuit substrate having driving elements separately positioned in a metal casing with a separating space there between to suppress heat transfer from the driving circuit substrate to the control circuit substrate.

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's independent claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by Sanada et al. As described above in reference to the Batten, Jr. et al. reference, Applicant's independent claim 1, and also independent claim 10, is narrowly drawn to recite very specific features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Sanada et al. reference. Specifically, Sanada et al. do not teach or suggest termination circuitry. See Figures 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B, for example, illustrating the control and driving circuitry which Sanada et al. explicitly and specifically teach. Also, as described above, Sanada et al. do not teach or suggest an overmold. Applicant notes Examiner's comment that "the meaning of 'overmold' is not clearly set forth in the claim and is thus deemed to be so broad that it is met by the applied reference as a housing cover." Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration. An "overmold" is a structural limitation specifically claimed by Applicant, illustrated in Figures 2, 3A, and 3B, described in detail in the specification, and further illustrated and described in Flowchart 150 shown in Figure 5 and accompanying text. Originally filed claims (now withdrawn due to Restriction Requirement) claimed the method for making the overmold. Applicant respectfully submits that the term "overmold" as clearly and specifically defined and illustrated in the instant application is not so broad as to be applicable to any "case" and requires

no additional recitation of structural limitation, since the structure is already limited to the precise description provided.

Dependent claim 5 is not anticipated by the Sanada et al. reference for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

In independent claim 10, Applicant has again a recited narrow, specific SCSI cable having an integrated terminator. Sanada et al. teaches control and driving circuitry. Sanada et al. do not teach termination circuitry, do not teach termination circuitry being electrically coupled to the first end of the SCSI cable, and do not teach an overmold. For at least these reasons, Sanada et al. do not teach each and every claim feature as recited by Applicants.

Applicant further notes that the Office suggests that Sanada et al. teach a ribbon cable as 4, while the Sanada et al. reference teach that 4 is a flexible printed circuit sheet (col. 4, line 1). Further, what the Office is suggesting is one device connector between the first end and the second end of the ribbon cable, is a connector to the flexible printed circuit sheet.

Regarding dependent claim 11, the Office suggests that Sanada et al. teach electrically passive circuitry. Applicant respectfully disagrees, submitting that control and driving circuitry is not electrically passive.

Regarding dependent claim 14, the Office suggests that Sanada et al. teach an overmold, and that the overmold provides a slim and aerodynamic profile. Applicant respectfully disagrees. See Figures 2A and 3A of the Sanada et al. reference, for example.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Sanada et al. reference fails to teach, or suggest, each and every element as set forth in Applicant's independent claims 1, and 10, and therefore fails to anticipate claims 1 and 10. Similarly, for at least the same reasons, Sanada et al. fails to anticipate Applicant's dependent claims 5, 11-12, and 14, each of which depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1 and 10. Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten, Jr. et al. in view of Sanada et al. This rejection is traversed, and Applicants request reconsideration.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the reference or to combine reference teaching. Additionally, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the combination of prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Office asserts that Batten, Jr. et al. teach each and every feature of independent claim 10 except for at least one device connector between the first end and the second end of the cable. Applicants respectfully disagree and request reconsideration. As described above, Applicant has positively recited in independent claim 10 termination circuitry, and termination circuitry being electrically coupled to the first end of the SCSI cable. While the Office may not give any weight to the cable being a SCSI cable since it is recited in the preamble, the structural feature of the termination circuitry being electrically coupled to the first end of the SCSI cable. Additionally, Batten, Jr. et al. do not teach or suggest an overmold. Finally, as described above, Sanada et al. fail to teach a ribbon cable (or a SCSI cable), and what the Office is suggesting is a ribbon cable is a flexible printed circuit sheet, as so described by the Sanada et al. reference at col. 4, line 1. A ribbon cable, or a SCSI cable, and a printed circuit sheet, flexible or otherwise, are not the same structural features or claim limitations.

For at least the above reasons, the combination of Batten, Jr. et al. and Sanada et al. fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Applicant's independent claim 10. For at least the same reasons, the asserted combination fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Applicant's dependent claim 13, which depends directly from independent claim 10. Applicant therefore respectfully requests these rejections be withdrawn.


Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten, Jr. et al. This rejection is traversed, and Applicants request reconsideration. Similar to the above, Applicant submits that Batten, Jr. et al. fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations recited in Applicant's independent claim 1, from which dependent claim 8 directly depends. Batten et al. fail to teach or suggest termination circuitry, and an encapsulating overmold (Applicant's claim amendments submitted herein). Since Batten, Jr. et al. do not suggest all of Applicant's claim limitations, the reference fails to render Applicant's application obvious, and Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/010,512
Amdt. dated June 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2003

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 13, and 8 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Batten, Jr. et al. and Sanada et al., and any combination thereof. Applicant requests reconsideration and that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-14. Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900, ext. 6905. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP202). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.


Rick von Wohld, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,018

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920